

Stopped at that point, the Attorney-General turned to a wider field, that of the attitude of the Conservative party generally, and of Hon. G. H. Ferguson in particular, toward the Ontario Temperance Act. H. Hill, Conservative member for East Ottawa, then invoked the chair's ruling as to whether this subject had anything to do with the bill. Mr. Speaker said that the discussion must be on the principle of the bill before the House.

Attorney-General Persists.

Still Mr. Raney pursued his course, and W. E. N. Sinclair, Liberal, Ontario South, interjected a comment, that the Attorney-General was far afield from the subject of the Liquor Transportation Bill. When Mr. Raney somewhat warmly queried as to whether he should have included Mr. Sinclair among the critics of the O.T.A., the member for South Ontario retorted. "I don't care where you put me," with emphasis on the "you."

Mr. Hill—Is the Attorney-General going to abide by the Speaker's ruling or not?

Mr. Raney—I am seeking to amend and improve the provisions of the temperance legislation in this Province. I am seeking to show that certain elements in the Province are seeking to destroy it. I think I am quite capable of judging whether my address has reference to the bill before the House.

Mr. Ferguson interjected to say that Mr. Raney's discussion had gone far afield, and Mr. Speaker again stated the rule that discussion on second reading must be on the principle of the bill.

Strengthen Anti-liquor Law.

Mr. Raney—It has been contended that the Ontario Temperance Act has proven a dismal failure. I want to try to make the law stronger.

Mr. Ferguson—I quite agree that the methods of administration should be improved.

Mr. Raney—I am going to show that certain members in this House, in this Province are opposed to the law. I am going to show what public opinion is, and what the attitude of the followers of the Conservative party is.

Mr. Speaker—If the amendment were a sweeping amendment to the O.T.A., there might be some justification for bringing in outside matters, and as I consider this only a small amendment, and as there will be an opportunity to discuss all the other matters, I think the ruling that only the principle of the bill should be discussed on second reading should be adhered to.

Hon. Mr. Parliament went on to say that the rule was laid out before him in the rule book in plain English, and he had no alternative but to quote it to the House when a ruling was sought.

Attorney-General Is Angry.

In very apparent anger, Hon. Mr. Raney commenced: "Mr. Speaker, this is the first time ——" and he cut short the remark and sat down. Rising again, he said there would be no opportunity of discussing the matter, as the House was at the close of the session.

"I do not like to have the honorable the Attorney-General intimate to me that I am trying to cut him off," said Hon. Mr. Parliament from the Speaker's chair. "The rule is in plain English that it is only the principle of the bill that can be discussed on second reading. May I suggest to the honorable the Attorney-General that he appeal to the House against my ruling?"

Hon. Mr. Raney—I will do that. J. W. Curry, K.C., Southwest Toronto, then proceeded to pour oil on the troubled waters by suggesting that the Attorney-General deal clause by clause with the measure. "I must say," he declared, "that I feel that the address of the Honorable the Attorney-General has been somewhat wide of the rules that are followed and adhered to by the House, but I do think there would be every opportunity in taking the bill up clause by clause."

Moves for Second Reading.

Mr. Raney—Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the bill.

With that he resumed his seat, having given the House no detailed explanation of the purpose of the bill.

Mr. Ferguson said he would discuss the matters referred to by the Attorney-General when the proper time came, and J. C. Tolmie, Liberal, of Windsor, expressed anxiety as to whether opportunity was to be afforded later for discussing the subjects with which Mr. Raney had attempted to deal. When the Attorney-General said he feared the session would be curtailed and no opportunity given, Mr. Tolmie thought the rules of the House might be stretched at the present time.

Mr. Lennox—I am quite certain there will be opportunity of discussing this. I propose to take it up in the House at the proper time. The Attorney-General needn't worry.

Mr. Curry—This matter is of sufficient importance that we ought to take the time of the House to discuss it, and I propose later to bring the matter up.

Then Mr. Halcrow, just before the bill was given second reading, expressed the opinion that there were a great many points of the O. T. A. that were unjust, and that soon the authorities would be regulating the clothing and the edibles of the individual.

Mr. Raney, in opening his speech on the second reading of the Bill, said he thought they had arrived at the culmination of the first stage of the campaign inaugurated some months ago against the Ontario Temperance Act. The first gun of that campaign had been fired by an organization known as the Liberty League, in a fulmination put out to the public in the early part of February of this year, just on the eve of the assembling of the Legislature. This organization, no doubt, was composed of respectable citizens, said Mr. Raney, and it had the right to advocate its point of view, but in the present instances there was associated with them in the campaign janissaries, mercenaries, bootleggers, moonshiners, blind-piggers and rum-runners.

Answers Lennox Charges.

After reading the circular, Mr. Raney referred to the charges made by Mr. Lennox in the House. Mr. Lennox, he said, had made one blanket charge and then gave instances to support his blanket charge. That blanket charge was that the Attorney-General had been knowingly employing thugs and criminals, and that some of them were in the employ of the department at the time the charges were made. Mr. Lennox had concluded his address by a series of questions. Because of the attitude of some members yesterday at the Public Accounts Committee, and because of an editorial that morning in a Toronto paper, he referred at this time to these charges.

Taking up the questions of Mr. Lennox one by one, Mr. Raney said:

"The member for North York supported his general charge, made in the House, that I had knowingly employed thugs and criminals in the enforcement of the Ontario Temperance Act, with particulars and at the close of his speech, he put these particulars in the form of questions addressed to me.

Lennox Still Insists.

"The member for North York still insisting, notwithstanding the proceedings in the Public Accounts Committee, that his charge against me is true, it is worth while, I think, that I should deal with these detailed instances specifically, so that the antidote may go with the poison. At the conclusion of his speech he summarized the specific instances in the form of a series of questions, and with these I propose now to deal, answered them seriatim.

"As the questions were directed to me I address my answers to Mr. Lennox.